

CR 4585

.B3

Copy 1

THE IMPIETY AND ABSURDITY OF
DUELLING.

SERMON

PREDICATED IN ST. PETER'S CHURCH, CHARLESTON,

ON THE 9TH DAY OF JUNE, 1844.

BY WILLIAM H. BARNWELL.

Minister of the Gospel, Charleston.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

CHARLESTON.

PRINTED BY WALKER & SURREY.

UNDER THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.

1844.



THE IMPIETY AND ABSURDITY OF
DUELLING.

A

S E R M O N

PREACHED IN ST. PETERS' CHURCH, CHARLESTON,

ON THE 9TH DAY OF JUNE, 1844.

17
By WILLIAM H. BARNWELL,

Rector of St. Peter's Church, Charleston.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.



CHARLESTON:
PRINTED BY WALKER & BURKE,
NORTH OF THE POST-OFFICE,
1844.

CR4585
.B3

TO
THE YOUNG MEN OF SOUTH-CAROLINA:

The following Discourse is affectionately dedicated by one who well knows the peculiar temptations to which they are exposed, by the evil custom against which he would warn them; and who earnestly prays that God will make them too brave to resent a personal injury—too honorable to fight one whom they have injured—too patriotic to seek the life of a fellow-citizen—and too pious, to set man's opinion above God's law, and maliciously attempt to destroy a being whom God has benevolently created.

With a lively interest in their best welfare, and a hope that they may ever evince on the field of moral action, the same high prowess and patient fortitude which their sires did on the battle-grounds and in the prison-ships of the Revolution,

He subscribes himself, affectionately,

Their friend and fellow-citizen,

WM. H. BARNWELL.

The following Sermon was written under peculiar disadvantages; but as it was requested for publication by those in whose judgment I feel confidence, it has not been withheld.

S E R M O N .

GEN. IV. 10.

“And he said what hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.”

We have here the arraignment by God, of the first murderer who stained this earth with gore. I design to base upon it a few remarks respecting a barbarous practice, still too common among us, which provokes Jehovah, and defies his law; disturbs the State, and spurns its enactments; destroys men, and afflicts their families; while it usually brings upon those that engage in it, certain misery, both here and hereafter. Of course you understand that I refer to Duelling. Our beloved State has bled at every pore through this murderous custom; some of her noblest sons have fallen its victims; and her choicest lives may yet be thrown away at any time, at its demand. Shall we do nothing to arrest this monstrous evil? Can religion avail nought? Is patriotism vain? Can philanthropy interpose no check? Can a mother's or a sister's love impose no restraint? Can manly friendship devise no remedy? Can wounded honor, in whose high name these outrages are perpetrated, suggest no substitute? But shall our posterity, to the latest generation, be subjected to this tyrant custom, so heathenish, so impious, so absurd? Shall we tolerate such a slander upon the venerable name of honor, as to admit that none can justly lay claim to it, but he who is prepared for a personal affront, to slay, or be slain by his fellow man? Shall our holy Religion not cry aloud with a voice of thunder, against those whose brothers' blood is crying out against them, from an innocent but ensanguined soil? Shall our boasted patriotism suffer the pride of our State—her jewels—her sons—to be turning their weapons with a Cain-like spirit against each other, and not interpose the strong arm of her undisputed sovereignty to arrest the evil, and punish the offender? And shall a virtuous and indignant public permit its sense of propriety to be outraged, without the most decided reprobation? Let it not be! but looking steadily at the evil in its true character and consequences—let us endeavor to devise and to carry into effect some remedy.

In my present remarks, I shall use great plainness of speech, and desire to address myself to the hearts and minds of all. All have been, or may be, sufferers from the practice: and all should feel an interest in its suppression.

The origin of duelling, like that of murder, with which it is identical, may be traced to Cain; for had his peaceful brother resisted his violence, a bloody combat must have ensued. Envy and malice are its ordinary stimulants; and if the unskilfulness of the combatants, or the providence of God, prevents death, temporal and eternal, from being the invariable result of the duel, no thanks are due to the parties engaged.

That duelling has become less common and fatal of late, may be readily admitted, but that it has entirely ceased none can pretend, and one fact which induces me to speak the more decidedly and solemnly on this subject, is the opinion which seems to gain ground, that even professors of religion are not exempted from the obligation of this Iron Law. If brethren after the Spirit, instead of forgiving injuries, or asking forgiveness, as the case may be, are to be contending with carnal, instead of spiritual weapons, it is time for the Ministers of God to be repeating God's address to Cain in the text: "What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground."

I must not however be supposed to imply that there are those present who justify the practice; on the contrary, your Minister knows no one among you who may be characterized as a duellist. Still the future is unknown; and few present can view duelling with more disapprobation than many who have fallen its victims.

We have pronounced the practice *heathenish*: and yet nominally christian princes are believed to have revived it in civilized Europe; while heathen nations, who know not the true God, have strictly prohibited it among their subjects. Yet what more savage and barbarous, than for those who bear the form of men, who believe in a future state, who belong to the same commonwealth, who are commanded by God's laws to love one another, and forbidden by human laws from injuring one another; who are bound to existence by many ties, and regard death as the close of their probation; to risk in a private quarrel their own valuable lives, for the wretched satisfaction of taking that of another? Were death a perpetual sleep, as heathenish nations have believed, then, to stake life for life on a personal issue, might be the less wondered at; for then, no voice of an angry God is

to be feared—no undone soul of a slaughtered fellow man is to be met—no widow's anguish, no orphan's tears are to be answered for—no outraged saints are to be faced as God's assessors in judgment, testifying against the public violation of divine and human enactments—no devil and his angels are to be expected inflicting everlasting torments upon those who receive the murderer's doom. But to those who believe that after death there is a judgment, and that "the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the people that forget God;" what should appear more opposed to the whole system of revealed Religion, than so cruel a usage? That the worshippers of a Mars, or a Moloch, should delight in blood, we might expect: but that the baptized people of the crucified Jesus, should tolerate so long an offence like this, must be a marvel to the elect Angels, and a joy to the hosts of Lucifer.

We have also called this custom an *impious* one. Surely none will deny this. Is it not impious to bid defiance to a known enactment of Jehovah? And is not the offence aggravated by the fact, that it at the same time destroys human life, which it is the province and design of that ordinance of God, human government, to secure, not only in being, but in well being?

By the law of God, as well as that of man, the duellist is a murderer. God's precept, given from Mount Sinai, is plain and strong: "Thou shalt not kill." Man's law is equally clear and emphatic: "Murder," says Blackstone, "is committed when a person of sound memory and discretion killeth any reasonable creature in being, with malice aforethought, either express or implied. Express malice is, when one, with a sedate deliberate mind, and formed design, doth kill another. This takes in the case of deliberate duelling, where both parties meet avowedly with an intent to murder." And this distinguished jurist has in this definition followed out the teachings of a divine lawgiver. For thus saith the Lord: "If a man smite his neighbor with an instrument of iron, so that he die, he is a murderer. And if he smite him with a hand weapon of wood, wherewith he may die, *and he die*, he is a murderer. And if he thrust him of hatred, or hurl at him, by lying in wait that he die, or in enmity smite him with his hand that he die, he that smote him shall surely be put to death, for he is a murderer."

The laws of many of our States stamp the duellist as a murderer; and if the Legislature of our own Commonwealth has relaxed upon this subject, this only furnishes additional reason for those who respect

her as a mother, to endeavor to induce her to perform her stern, but imperious duty. It may be, and is often said, the duellist is not always a murderer—his antagonist does not always fall, and even where he does fall, malice may not have winged the fatal bullet. But can the failure to perpetrate a crime diminish in the sight of God and man the moral turpitude? And can the absence of conscious malice excuse him who aims a deadly weapon at his brother's person? We verily believe that the disposition to palliate the duellist's conduct is one fruitful cause of its continuance. How can he escape the imputation of murder in the estimation of all moral and intelligent beings? He has done one of these two things. He has either maliciously designed to destroy the life of a fellow being; or, without conscious malice has pursued a course directly calculated to effect this destruction. If he be influenced by malice, then whether he destroys his antagonist or not, Jehovah counts him guilty.—“For whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him”—and according to the theory of most civilized nations, (whatever their practice may be,) malice aforethought, which is essential to murder, is implied by the act of a deliberate duel. But if he be not conscious of ill will against his adversary, and goes upon the field simply to adjust the point of honor, should man acquit of condemnation one, who for the sake of a self-constructed code, puts at peril the lives of two citizens, and sets an example of contempt towards both divine and human tribunals? Were it not for that undue influence, which the wicked and foolish are permitted to exercise over the judgment and conduct of the wise and good, would a duellist ever be skreened from trial? Would he often escape sentence?

And is it to be supposed that the plea, of no conscious ill-will, can avail him at God's Bar, when for the sake of the popular breath, he has dared to meet Jehovah, rather than fail to meet an earthly foe? Not his own, but bought with a price, the redeemed creature of the Lord God Almighty; has he a right, for some private wrong, to bring both himself and another of God's redeemed creatures within the range of deadly weapons, and then say, that there was no ill-will in their hearts. Let us have done with such sophistries. Let us call things by their right names. Before God and man the duellist is a murderer, and until all persons who reverence God, and love their country, agree to look upon his course as impious, we may expect many valuable lives to be lost.

But duelling is impious, not only in being murderous, but in that,

it places human opinion above the Divine enactments, and leads those who practice it, to fear men rather than God. This is a heinous offence. God, who is jealous, is sure to punish it—unless repented of. Even the best of men are but blind and erring creatures, often deviating from their own adopted principles and prescribed course of action—and when possessed of the Supreme power, even that of life and death, what is man that he should be feared like God? “Fear not them,” said the Saviour, “which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.” Yet this pernicious system diligently inculcates into the minds of our sons, that they should dread the stigma of cowardice affixed by the false breath of the blasphemer, the slanderer, the Sabbath-breaker, the adulterer, and the knave, more than the awful vengeance of an insulted God; and teaches them to shrink from the significant shrug or sarcastic laugh of the street-lounger, more than from the tremendous lighting down of Jehovah’s arm, which blasts and overwhelms those, who have provoked Him to laugh at their calamity, and to mock when their fear cometh. How impious such a system! how imperative the duty to strive, by all proper means, to overthrow it. I call upon every one before me who abhors impiety, to unite in banishing from society a usage which thus dethrones Jehovah and His Sovereign Law from their rightful place in the human conscience, and sacrilegiously sets up there vain man, and his despicable code of false honor.

But we have also termed duelling *absurd*. And is it not, both as to its theory and its practice? Its theory is, that one who is ready to vindicate with his person his character as a man of honor, is justly entitled to this character, and no matter whether he be a drunkard, or a liar, or a cheat, or an adulterer, or a coward, yet if he shrink not from this specific test, his reputation for honor can never be questioned, and those who refuse to accord it to him may expect his displeasure.—Now is not this an absurd theory? Does the fact that a man has given and received with firmness the fire of an opponent, prove any thing as to his innocence or guilt, of the charges preferred against him? Is he less of a drunkard, or a liar, or a cheat, or an adulterer, or even of a coward, because after regular, systematic training, he can face the mouth of a pistol without trembling? The theory then is absurd. It illustrates nothing. It settles nothing—that is, nothing as to the point of honor involved—though it does illustrate the folly of man, when he would contrive a system opposite to God’s: and it does settle the insufficiency of the code of honor—a code, often compiled and admin-

istered by those, to whom, except in this technical sense, it would be profanation to ascribe a sense of honor.

And is the practice of duelling less absurd than its theory? Who does not know that it has been reduced by its most accomplished professors to a regular scheme of manœuvring for conceived advantages? Its diplomacy often occupies weeks—and the ancient chivalry would blush at the arts which are now resorted to, to prevent a fair trial of the combatants' prowess; and after all, what more common than for the rencontre, even after being honorably adjusted, to lead to fresh and more virulent broils growing out of the alleged misconduct of one of the parties on the field of battle?

But that the absurdity of this practice may be more apparent, we proceed to show that the duellist pursues a course which is cowardly and dishonorable, and as it is courage and honor, which the custom is lauded by its advocates, as serving to promote, if we can succeed in making good our positions, we hope the high estimation which it is permitted to enjoy in the minds of the unreflecting, will be at once undermined, and the practice, like many others of a barbarous age, sink forever into merited contempt.

We take the ground then broadly, that the duellist is a *coward*. He lacks that very courage, that manly spirit which he boasts, and which he by this very conduct, endeavors to evince. The very act of consenting to fight a duel, instead of exhibiting his bravery, proves him to be just so far defective in this quality; and the oftener he engages in personal combats of this kind, the oftener does he expose his actual cowardice, and render himself justly obnoxious to that very galling stigma which he fights to avoid. I mean not to say that every one who has been or is a duellist, is in all respects, and under all circumstances, a coward, either constitutionally or morally, for unhappily some of the most heroic men have allowed themselves to be drawn into the practice. But I do mean to say, that just so far as persons permit themselves to become involved in duelling, they are acting under the influence of the fear of man, and are pursuing a course which should characterize them as poltrons. For what is more cowardly than for one to be driven from the maintenance of his own deliberate judgment by the fear of the judgment of others? Can he be properly called brave, who is not ready in conscious integrity, and reliance upon God, to abide by the consequences of his own principles and conduct, doing right where he sees he has done wrong, and forgiving rather than resenting private injuries which he has received? Now,

this, the duellist shrinks from, and prefers to risk the lives of two immortal beings rather than carry out the convictions of his own judgment, in opposition to the opinion of his worldly associates.

It may be objected, that we are supposing the duellist to be influenced exclusively by the opinions of the world, whereas he may be prompted in his stern career by the desire of revenge—and in order to attain it, may be ready to defy the very public opinion to which he is charged with being subservient. But even in such a case, there is more cowardice than may at first be supposed: for if revenge be analyzed, it will be found to consist in no slight degree, of a fear of future injury from the object who is conceived to have inflicted a previous wrong; and none will deny that it is far more brave to forgive an injury, and forbear diminishing, by retaliation, the power to repeat it, of which he who committed it is possessed, than to seek by his destruction, an exemption from its recurrence. Prudence might say—"If I revenge not this injury, I shall be subjected to worse"—but a lofty and daring courage would exclaim—"I scorn to take revenge—for I no more fear any injuries for the future, than I am daunted by any that have been already inflicted." So that even where the duellist is instigated in his dark career, not by the opinion of others, but by his own innate thirst for vengeance, it is obvious that his conduct has been influenced by fear. If one be truly and in every respect brave, why need he, in a civilized community, ever be engaged in a personal combat? Has he actually or in the conception of another, done a wrong? Let him evince his courage by acknowledging it and making amends; and while a timid, skulking spirit shrinks from the future consequences of such an acknowledgment, let him not be afraid of encountering them calmly. Has he been injured? and have his reasonable and proper efforts to obtain redress proved unavailing? Let him attest to the world, as well as to his aggressor, the unterrified firmness of his spirit by pursuing the even tenor of his duty, in the very face of one who has already attempted, and may at any time again attempt, to do him harm. "He that is slow to anger," saith the wise man, "is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city."

And surely none who contend for a mastery over others, should lose sight of the apostle's direction: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

Whatever exceptions may be furnished then, by individual cases, we take it to be proved, that whenever an individual, consents to

resort to the duel, for the adjustment of a personal controversy, he is acting the part of a coward, and deserves the contempt rather than the admiration of all who value true bravery as an important element of public or private character. It is related of him whom our Union honors as the father of his country, while even despotic governments acknowledge his Republican heroism; that early in life, before Braddock's defeat, in some public controversy with a British officer, he received a blow. A duel was of course looked for; and when the youthful Washington requested a private interview with his opponent, this last, expected a desperate rencontre. Judge then of his surprise, when after the obvious struggle of a truly noble soul, subduing the evil influences of a false system of honor, which had been early imbibed, the future deliverer of his people from British domination, frankly acknowledged that his own excited language had provoked the blow, and that he felt constrained by a sense of justice to ask forgiveness. The foe was melted to a friend. And if there be any who suppose that when a short time afterwards on the Monongahela, he bared so freely his person to the deadly rifle of the Indian, and covered himself with martial glory, or that subsequently, in the war of the Revolution, when no danger, however great or near, no power or device, of an overwhelming and skilful enemy, no desertion, or lukewarmness of his countrymen, seemed to shake in the slightest degree the settled fortitude of his manly soul; if there be any who suppose that on any subsequent occasion of his eventful life, the man whom his country delights to honor, exhibited more true bravery, than when he resisted the force of an evil custom, by undoing his own wrongful act, rather than avenging that of his opponent; he knows but little of the nature of true courage, and is confounding the mock heroism of a bravado, with the genuine daring of a truly brave spirit.

But we have undertaken to shew that the duellist acts not only a cowardly but a *dishonorable* part. I speak not now of the trickery and management which have been interwoven into the system—the various devices which those, who boast themselves, as the only men of honor, habitually resort to for the purpose of cheating an antagonist of his life—but we charge it upon the system itself, that it is essentially opposed to a true sense of honor. Is not this apparent from the case of Washington, already cited? Had he challenged and fought one, whom he felt he had provoked by a previous wrong, would not this have been dishonorable? Is not a sense of justice intimately connected with a sense of honor? And can any thing justify one

who, conscious of having inflicted an injury, refuses to repair it, but on the contrary vainly attempts to heal its wound by the infliction of another still greater? It is true that the offer to expose our own person to the fire of an antagonist, savors of that self-sacrificing spirit, which is an element of true honor,—but this is not usually the reparation which is in the first place asked for, and is only the alternative demanded, where a satisfactory explanation or apology is refused, and if the ordeal consisted in the one who was conceived to have aggrieved the other, submitting to become a target, without seeking to add murder to the previous injury, there might be something like honor in being ready to atone by our life, for wrongs, which the recipient refused to forgive, without such a sacrifice. But when a fellow-being conceives himself wronged by our conduct, for us not only to refuse to make such reparation as the case properly admits of, but to offer him the privilege of taking our life, provided we enjoy the opportunity of taking his, is, when properly weighed in the scale of true honor, as wretchedly wanting, as when placed in the balance of the sanctuary. In illustration of this view, let us examine the case already adverted to, that of Charles the V., and Francis the 1st,—a case whose influence has been thus graphically described by a living writer. “It descended like a mighty torrent from the highest elevation of rank, down to the humble vale of private life. Through all Europe, the pulse of honor began to throb, and all orders of men caught the fever. The nobleman, and the nobleman’s servant, the general and the common soldier, the lawyer, the merchant, the tailor and the hair-dresser, became suddenly inflated with the inspirations of honor. The forms of law were disregarded; every man became his own judge, his own protector and avenger, until in this crusade of honor the earth smoked with the blood of its miserable inhabitants. Much of the best blood of Christendom was shed, many useful lives sacrificed, and at some periods war itself had hardly been more destructive, than these perverted contests of honor.” Take even that royal example of a challenge to personal combat, the pretext for which may have been, the wish to save their innocent subjects from the consequences of their sovereigns feuds. Can it be supposed that true honor would not have dictated as a substitute for such a conflict, a sincere and faithful reparation of the mutual injuries conceived to form the basis of their quarrel? Had the Chevalier de Bayard, known to fame as the Knight, “without fear, and without reproach,” been permitted to arbitrate between his loved sovereign and the German

Emperor, think you he would not have said, colored, though his mind was, with the romantic chivalry of his day: "Abandon your jealousies: be content with that extent of dominion, and degree of renown, to which you are justly entitled. Do mutual justice to each other's claims, and involve not Christendom in fruitless wars. Nor vainly think to save others by perilling your own persons in single combat. True bravery, and true honor, can never consist with envy and injustice." Such, we may conceive, would have been the award of this flower of Europe's chivalry, who, at the battle of Marignan, when mortally wounded, seated himself against a tree, with his face to the foe, saying, that as he had never in life turned his back from his sovereign's enemies, so in death he would confront them—an example which the humblest and weakest Christian would do well to imitate as to the spiritual adversaries of his heavenly king.

We trust then it has been made apparent that duelling, is as much opposed to a true sense of honor, as it is to genuine bravery—and yet, these are the sentiments it professes to cherish. Must not that system be absurd, which defeats the very principles it engages to maintain?

It would be difficult to find a more striking, yet melancholy instance of the pernicious power which this custom possesses in rendering for a time irrational, the strongest minds, than that of the gifted and distinguished Alexander Hamilton—the friend and private Secretary of Washington—the comrade of his tent, the leading member of his cabinet. He fell, as most of you are aware, in a duel by the hand of Col. Burr. But before going to the field, he left in writing a solemn and explicit condemnation of the very course he was about to pursue. Did our limits admit of it, we would cite the whole document, for we have always regarded it as an evidence of the force of truth, extorting from an ingenuous mind an utter reprobation of a course which a false conception of honor constrained it to pursue. Yet, surely this should furnish but little palliation of his offence in deliberately acting contrary to the dictates of that inward monitor which the Almighty has established as His vicegerent in the human soul. The document referred to may be found in Adams' Moral Philosophy, in the chapter on "duelling."

It will be seen, that we have not attempted to enter fully into this subject, but have only thrown together such remarks as have been naturally suggested. We have indeed omitted to bring to your notice, many facts, and observations of others, with which we are furnished

and which on some other occasion may be offered. We have omitted too, to present the subject in an evangelical point of view. We have not brought prominently to your minds, the light which should be cast upon the enormities of this practice, by that stupendous fact of the Christian scheme—Incarnate Deity redeeming His enemies by His own blood. We have spoken but little of that blood which speaketh better things than that of Abel's; for while *his* cried aloud from the earth against his brother, *that* proclaims from Heaven, pardon and peace, and a full and free justification, even to the Cain-like manslayer, should he repent—nay, offers to make him repent, by opening to him a fountain, where even the murderer may be washed white. Oh, when I think of Calvary—when my mind dwells upon that scene in Jerusalem, when the King of the Jews, the Lord of Glory, was rejected by his own people whom he came to save, and set at naught by the Gentile Rulers—when the shame and ignominy of his cross are remembered, and I pass in imagination with him, with that heavy symbol of his disgrace and instrument of his punishment, upon his shoulders, through all that mocking city—and reflect, that all this was patiently endured for his enemies; and then call to mind that such enemies we all of us were, and by nature still are, and that if reconciled by His death, and made willing subjects by His sweetly constraining grace, we are bound to follow him—to glory in His cross, and to become crucified to the world—loving our enemies, blessing them that curse us, and doing good to them that hate us. I see not how we can look without decided and utter condemnation at a system, whose origin is, like murder, one of the first fruits of the fall—whose stimulants are envy and revenge, or impious vanity; and whose almost invariable result, is the destruction of souls, if not of bodies—while from beginning to end, it is utterly at variance with the fundamental principle of that Redemption, in which the only begotten Son of God died the just for the unjust; and instead of taking vengeance for our transgressions, blotted them out as a thick cloud, nailing them with his own body to the tree. But I have already drawn upon your patience, by exceeding my usual limits.

Do you ask what remedy I would prescribe for the fearful evil of which I have been speaking? I answer,

First, detest and reprobate the practice—until this be done, no other can be completely effectual. So long as the duellist is respected by the virtuous, no laws, human, or divine, can effectually suppress the custom. We must unite together in one firm and virtuous band, to

cast odium upon a sense of honor, so false and barbarous, as that which lies at the very foundation of this custom. We must look at this evil, as God looks at it. We must speak of it, as God speaks of it. Instead of the duel, and the duellist, let us speak of the act and the agent, as the murder and the murderer! and let us deal with the duellist as with the highwayman and the assassin. Let woman shudder with abhorrent disgust at the sight of him, even as Eve may be conceived to have shrunk from her first-born, as he returned reeking in the blood of Abel. Let the patriot resolutely determine never to countenance in any way, the man, who by his practice, sanctions duelling. Let the sober citizen turn away with silent censure from the man of blood. Above all, let the christian, the follower of the meek and lowly Jesus, who prayed for his murderers and died for his enemies—set his face like a flint, against the perpetrators and abettors of such deeds, and while he prays for their repentance and conversion, let him avoid all social fellowship with them, until they have acknowledged their fault, and professed a godly purpose never again to repeat it.

Next. I would urge as that which should always precede, accompany, and follow, our detestation of this and every other vice—let us earnestly pray to God, who is the source of all light and truth, that He will enlighten the minds of those who uphold this system, and make them see the fearful enormity of its criminality, and lead them at once to abhor and abandon it. It is to God that other communities, which were once afflicted by the prevalence of this destructive evil, owe their deliverance from it; and it becomes us to look to Him for a similar reformation among ourselves.

Next. I would suggest—though aware of the jealousy which some feel as to Ministers of the Gospel referring to State affairs—yet I would suggest that our Legislature be solemnly called upon, to devise and carry into effect, some legal barrier against this evil, which too often enters the very halls of legislation, and the courts of justice, and pollutes, by a spurious honor, and a time-serving spirit, those who should pass and administer the laws, in the fear of God, and of God only.

But *lastly.* If our Legislature refuses to act, let each christian and virtuous citizen do what he can in his individual capacity. Let him refuse to contribute to elevate to any office of honor, profit or trust, the advocate and practitioner of duelling—but as he hopes for God's blessing upon the administration of public affairs, let it be his effort to prevent them from being entrusted to hands, which are ready to imbrue themselves, for the slightest private affront, in a brother's blood.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 022 211 917 0